

Friday, May 26, 2006, and on Memorial Day. Further, both of Plaintiffs' counsel had depositions scheduled for much of last week. All of this has left Plaintiffs' counsel without sufficient time to work on these two responsive briefs. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that the deadline to file Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Stay be extended one day to Wednesday, May 31, 2006.

3. When Plaintiffs' counsel, Kortney M. Kloppe-Orton spoke to Defendants' counsel Matt Wolper last week about a possible extension for both responsive briefings, he indicated that he was not opposed to an extension until June 1, 2006. Though in their last communication Ms. Kloppe-Orton told Mr. Wolper that she did not think Plaintiffs would need an extension and had decided not to seek one, counsel assumes that Mr. Wolper, who indicated he would be out of town this week, still would not oppose the motion. Plaintiffs' counsel has attempted to confer with Bennett Falk, but had not heard back from him by the time this Motion was filed.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the parties request that the Court grant the Motion for Extension of Time.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPKIN, OLIVER & BRADLEY, L.L.P.
1020 N.E. Loop 410, Suite 810
San Antonio, Texas 78209
Telephone: (210) 820-0082
Facsimile: (210) 930-8500

By: Kortney Kloppe-Orton
MARVIN G. PIPKIN
State Bar No. 16026600
KORTNEY M. KLOPPE-ORTON
State Bar No. 00794104
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been sent via certified mail, return receipt requested, to the following counsel of record on this the 30th day of May, 2006:

Seagal V. Wheatley
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.
113 E. Pecan Street, Suite 900
San Antonio, Texas 78205-1533

Ellen Bush Sessions
Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799

Matthew Wolper
Bressler Amery & Ross, P.C.
P.O. Box 279807
Miramar, Florida 33027


Kortney M. Kloppe-Orton

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

TRAVIS CO. JOINT VENTURE, §
ROGER C. HILL, SR., & §
CHRISTOPHER HILL §

Plaintiffs, §

vi. §

CASE NO. 06-CV-146

HENNESSEE GROUP, L.L.C., §
ELIZABETH LEE HENNESSEE §
and CHARLES J. GRADANTE §

Defendants. §

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

On this date came on to be considered the Motion for Extension of Time filed by Plaintiffs Travis Co. Joint Venture, Roger Hill, Sr., and Christopher Hill on May 30, 2006, seeking an extension of Plaintiffs' deadline to file their Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Claims Pending Arbitration. After considering the Motion, the Court is of the opinion that the Motion should hereby be GRANTED.

It is therefore ORDERED that Plaintiffs may file a Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Claims Pending Arbitration on or before May 31, 2006

SIGNED this _____ day of _____, 2006.

JUDGE PRESIDING